

Remarks

The non-final Office Action dated November 5, 2007 lists the following objections and rejections: the specification is objected to under 35 U.S. C. § 112(1); claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 112(1) and 35 U.S. C. § 112(2); and claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Overtoom *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,218). Claims 4-5 and 7-8 are allowed. Applicant appreciates the allowance of these claims. Applicant has added new claim 9, which depends from claim 5. Applicant respectfully submits that, as is consistent with the instant Office Action, new claim 9 is also in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the specification under § 112(1) and the § 112(1) rejection of claims 1-3 are moot because the amended claims are fully enabled and fully supported by Applicant's disclosure. For example, Figure 1 shows a first device station (*e.g.*, USB device 8) coupled to a first port (*e.g.*, second host port H2) and a further device station (*e.g.*, PDA 4) coupled to a second port (*e.g.*, first host port H1). The PDA 4 communicates with USB device 8, and PDA 4 appears as a host station to USB device 8. *See, e.g.*, paragraph 0015. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the specification and the § 112(1) rejection of claims 1-3 be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 112(2) rejection of claims 1-3 because the phrase "said second port on behalf of said first device station" has sufficient antecedent basis. For example, antecedent basis for "said second port" can be found in claim 1, line 2 (*i.e.*, "a second communication port") and antecedent basis for "said first device station" can be found in claim 1, line 7 (*i.e.*, "a first device station"). Thus, the phrase "said second port on behalf of said first device station" does not cause the claims to be vague or indefinite because there is antecedent basis for the identified claim terms. Accordingly, the § 112(2) rejection of claims 1-3 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 because the cited portions of the Overtoom reference do not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, aspects directed to a bus station that is arranged to operate as an alternate host station in a second mode of operation. During the second mode of

operation, a further device station is coupled to a second communication port and a first device station is coupled to a first communication port, with the further device station appearing as a host station to the first device station. The Office Action asserts that A-port 202 and B-port 204 of Overtoom's hub 102 correspond to the first and second ports of the claimed bus station, respectively. The Office Action further identifies the situation when nothing is connected to B-port 204 as corresponding to the claimed second mode. However, the claimed invention requires that the further device station be coupled to the second port during the second mode of operation. The claimed bus station allows the further device station to communicate with the first device station, and the further device station appears as a host to the first device station; however, neither of the device stations is a host. Thus, the claimed invention allows two devices to communicate with each other without needing one of the devices to be a host.

In contrast, the cited portions of Overtoom teach that B-port 204 is an override port to which hub 102 always defers control when a PC is connected thereto (*see, e.g.*, Figure 6, Col. 3:32-36, and Col. 5: 23-46). When the PC is not connected to B-port 204, hub 102 determines which of the devices connected to A-ports 202 are OTG devices (On-the-Go devices are dual-role devices that can act as a host) and then hub 102 waits for one of these devices to request host control of the USB bus (*see, e.g.*, Col. 3:59 to Col. 4:10). Thus, Overtoom's hub 102 simply enables the OTG devices connected to A-ports 202 to switch between which device acts as the host. Overtoom's hub 102 does not allow two non-host devices to communicate with each other because hub 102 merely transfers host control to a host device that is connected to one of A-ports 202. The hub 102 does not operate as an alternate host during communications between two devices that are connected to A-ports 202.

In view of the above, the cited portions of the Overtoom reference do not correspond to the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant has also added new claims 10-13, which depend from claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 10-13 are in condition for allowance over the Overtoom reference for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to § 102(e) rejection of claim 1, because the cited portions of Overtoom do not correspond to the claimed invention.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No.: 32,122

651-686-6633

(NXPS.407PA)